

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Mark Dewayne Bradwell,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	C/A No. 0:12-1228-TMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Cecilla R. Reynolds, Warden,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Petitioner, Mark Dewayne Bradwell, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed this Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report (ECF No. 25 at 9). However, Petitioner filed no objections to the Report.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 25) and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 14) is **GRANTED**, that Petitioner's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 21) is **DENIED**, and Petitioner's Petition is **DISMISSED** as untimely.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
April 22, 2013

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.